

Date: Sun, 24 Jul 94 04:30:07 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #326
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Sun, 24 Jul 94 Volume 94 : Issue 326

Today's Topics:

 After 93 days, the wait is over!
 Experimentation! (was: Re: reply)
 FCC 610 form in postscript
 Home address or PO box on 610
 reply (2 msgs)
 What is wrong with ham radio (2 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Fri, 22 Jul 1994 14:29:31 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!darwin.sura.net!
jabba.ess.harris.com!mlb.semi.harris.com!controls.ccd.harris.com!
bal@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: After 93 days, the wait is over!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

David L. Sampson (DAVID_SAMPSON@QM.IS.LMSC.LOCKHEED.COM) wrote:

: IMHO, 90+ days is absurd. I am going to write my US Representative,
: Senators and the VP suggesting that they consider privatizing the amateur
: license "issuing operation." Surely a better job could be done by a private
: corporation. Personally, I would have been willing to pay \$25-\$50, if I
: meant I could get my license in 5 business days or less.

I think what you would end up with is paying \$25-\$50 and still waiting in
excess of a month. (Consider VE processing, VEC processing, private company

processing, US Mail between all three and yourself!) Not worth it in my opinion.

The latest issue of CQ magazine has an article on the FCC license plant in PA. If I remember the article correctly, it states that the FCC is shooting for 35 days total turn around time.. This would translate into a total turn around time of about 45 days.

I think they are just now overcoming the transition to a new information system. We will have to see if they can get the lag down to 35 days.

Some other things mentioned in the CQ article include the Vanity call sign system and electronic filing. If you want to really want to push for improvement, push for electronic filing. This would allow the current VECs take on some of the data entry load. This would also take out at least one US mail delay.

As one last parting comment,... let me add that I understand your frustration. I first took my No-code Technician license in November 92. Of the 20 months since then, I have waited a combined total of 47 weeks (~11 months) waiting for licenses / upgrades.

73, Bruce AD4TG

--

Bruce Lifter
Harris Corporation
Controls Division

MS: R5-202
email: blifter@ccd.harris.com

Date: 23 Jul 94 19:53:00 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: Experimentation! (was: Re: reply)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

<Those days are gone, never to return. The professionals that I
<talk to on campus (EE profs) are surprised that anyone would make
<radio a hobby. To them it's an 8-hour per day job. Oh sure, there
<will always be a small percentage that are also hams, just
<like there is a small percentage of bakers that are hams.

EE profs wherever you are must not have a passion for their profession. that would make me wonder if they were really wanting to be in EE and if they were any good at instructing and transferring that passion to their students.

I know one criteria that is looked at among others when attempting to rank possible new hires is looking at what they do above and beyond the minimum. everyone has a BSEE -- but of those you find some that build their own stereos

or have a ham license and are operating, or program their own computers.

They have a passionate interest in electronics and electrical engineering that goes beyond mere book learnin'. When you have the passion AND the knowledge you get someone who will usually go pretty far.

Some people, it's just a job. And they aren't poor designers because of it, and will do fine - but when it's "only a job", practical aspects can be missed because there's no 'feel' for task.

bill wb9ivr

Date: 24 Jul 1994 02:45:26 UTC
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!nic-nac.CSU.net!charnel.ecst.csuchico.edu!olivea!quack!
quack.kfu.com!nsayer@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: FCC 610 form in postscript
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Well, v3.04 of the postscript FCC 610 form has been stable for quite some time. It can be ftp'd from ftp.kfu.com. It has not necessarily been approved by the FCC, but I did send them an earlier copy of the form and have incorporated their corrections. Personally, I think it looks better than what I got from them in the mail originally. :-)

Not only will this code print out a blank form, but by pre-pending some additional postscript of your own, it will print a fully filled-out form ready for you to sign. I should think that this would be a real boon for exam sessions, but what do I know? :-)

Anyway, I hope that saves the commission and the league (though I admit to be a life-non-member) some stamps. Let me know if you find any errors or have any comments. I also hope someone will let me know when/if there are form revisions so I can keep it in check.

--
Nick Sayer <nsayer@quack.kfu.com> | "We sacrifice every third
N6QQQ @ N0ARY.#NOCAL.CA.USA.NOAM | religious nut. The second one
+1 408 249 9630, log in as 'guest' | just left."
PGP 2.3 key and geek code via finger | -- sign on door.

Date: Sun, 24 Jul 94 02:06:00 -0400
From: hearst.acc.Virginia.EDU!pplace!pat.wilson@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Home address or PO box on 610

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

-> You have two addresses to provide. One is your mailing address and
-> the other is the location of your transmitter. Your mailing address
-> can be where ever you want. Your transmitter address should be where
-> you transmitter is.
-> They can be the same but your transmitter address can't be a P.O.
-> box.

Actually, you are wrong. You have to provide a mailing address only
now.

NØRDQ

Date: Sat, 23 Jul 1994 18:02:20 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!math.ohio-state.edu!uwm.edu!mixcom.com!
kevin.jessup@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: reply
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In <CtECEo.19K@freenet.buffalo.edu> aj229@freenet.buffalo.edu (Daniel Gurzynski)
writes:

>Just a reply to your question about lurkers ! I've been following
>tha sig for a little while. Aside from the fact that I really like
>code and would hate to see it dissappear, I think it serves a valid
>purpose. You can always memorize a battery of test questions without
>any understanding whatsoever, but it takes honest real effort to
>learn code and get up to speed. I would keep the requirement just
>to keep the requirements a little tough.

If the multiple guess question pools are so easily memorized, perhaps
the tests should be fill in the blank and show your work style tests.
I know, I know: a horrifying thought to 99% of today's operators.

--
kevin.jessup@mixcom.com | Vote Libertarian!
|
| Call 1-800-682-1776
| for more information.

Date: Sat, 23 Jul 1994 14:08:22 GMT
From: psinntp!arrl.org!zlau@uunet.uu.net

Subject: reply
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

kevin jessup (kevin.jessup@mixcom.mixcom.com) wrote:

: >A good example is the groups that fight for the America's Cup in
: >sailing. I would wager that most of them consider sailing as an

: I would like to expand on that thought. Consider other "hobbies" such
: as competitive sailing, auto racing, aerobatic flying, or even bicycle
: racing.

: Besides the competitor or "operator" of the device used to compete, there
: also is the device on/by which the the competitor is competing. This is
: where the competence and dedication of the DESIGNER is important. While
: perhaps not as publicized as the efforts of the individual directly
: involved in the competition/hobby, the integrity, design expertise and
: technology that went into the vehicle/device used in the competition/hobby
: is just as important.

: Amateur radio has no shortage of competitions either. However, TECHNICAL

: Why are points not awarded for equipment of one's own design? Why, in fact,
: are there ABSOLUTELY NO ARRL competitions involved with DESIGN? IMO, this
: is a serious problem with amateur radio today. The "this is a hobby not a

How to the competitive events mentioned factor in the design element?

More pointedly, how do they decide what a really good design advance to the
state of the art is and how do they factor it in to give that competitor an
advantage? What if the competitor knows precisely what to do, but lacks
the \$\$\$ to implement it properly so it is an actual advantage?

The ARRL does award the Technical Excellence Award each year, but this
is by no means a directed competition.

Personally, I don't see directed competitions as being particularly useful,
especially when there is already a big pot of \$\$\$ waiting for those who
could win it (stuff with lots of commercial possibilities that just has
to be proven to work, not sold to people who might be able to use it)

What happens is the stuff you want to see--well, that is proprietary.
The stuff you do see is generally proven not to work--decades ago.
Coupled with all the rushed work to meet the deadline (unless you
want it to go on and on), I doubt that the work involved in trying to
judge the the event is really worthwhile.

Of course, if there is a rich benefactor to put up real money....

anyone out there with lots of \$\$\$ they need to get rid of?

--

Zack Lau KH6CP/1 2 way QRP WAS
 8 States on 10 GHz
Internet: zlau@arrl.org 10 grids on 2304 MHz

Date: Sat, 23 Jul 1994 20:49:08 GMT
From: news.pipeline.com!malgudi.oar.net!witch!ted!mjsilva@uunet.uu.net
Subject: What is wrong with ham radio
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <rogjdCtECwp.GKL@netcom.com>, Roger Buffington (rogjd@netcom.com) writes:

>Jay Maynard (jmaynard@nyx10.cs.du.edu) wrote:

>: Yet another person with academic and engineering blinders on.

>

>: Ham radio is *NOT* just a technical hobby. Your proposals will drive off
>: everyone who's not an engineer - and that will kill it faster than anything
>: else I can think of.

>: --

>

>Agreed.

>

>Dunno what it's like elsewhere, but here in Southern California the
>no-code license has been a smashing success. We are getting new and
>often young blood into the hobby from all walks of life. Plumbers,
>lawyers, doctors, CPAs, truck drivers, you name it. As a group, the
>techs tend to be outstanding ops. Many of them quickly buckle down and
>master CW, and upgrade to general, advanced, and extra. You are starting
>to hear callsigns on HF which weren't issued in the 40s, 50s and 60s.
>That wasn't true a few years ago.

I too agree that ham radio is not just a technical hobby, and I wouldn't want to limit it to just those with engineering-level skills. Still, there's a vast distance between that level of skills and the embarrassing lack of knowledge I sometimes hear on the local repeaters. We have all heard things that could never be said by someone who actually knew the material for the test they passed. I was no radio engineer when I passed my (early '70s version) Advanced test while in high school, and, since I've never built a piece of RF gear for profit, I don't consider that I'm one now. Still, I've learned a lot since then, following my own path at my own speed, and that's all that I would expect from any ham

>

>If these chaps, who are allegedly only memorizing tests, can learn cw and
>upgrade (which they are doing in droves) it would appear that the cw
>requirement is readily surmountable. Surely an Engineer with such mental
>powers and interest in the hobby as the original poster of this thread
>can manage 13 wpm. (I did it when I was 11.)

>

I'll pass up the opportunity to say anything about CW, and note that I
also sense a lot of upgrade activity (incentive licensing as it is
supposed to work). I would go further and ask why we can't return to
a limited term for entry-level licenses? What if we made both Novice
and Tech licenses good for only (!) five years, after which up or
out? This would require the existence of a higher grade of no-code
license, but can't we expect that after five years a Novice or Tech
should be able to pass at least the General test (code or no-code)?

Mike, KK6GM

Date: 23 Jul 94 23:35:18 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!headwall.Stanford.EDU!abercrombie.Stanford.EDU!
paulf@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: What is wrong with ham radio
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

kevin.jessup@mixcom.mixcom.com (kevin jessup) writes:

>[...] Perhaps that is the problem: it's not SCIENCE, it's an ART!

This is a problem? Why? Yes, RF engineering is mostly an art. Always has
been. And RF operation is an art even moreso.

--

--Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "We are meant to be masters of destiny,
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | not victims of fate." -- Ronald W. Reagan

Date: Sat, 23 Jul 1994 20:03:32 GMT
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!kahuna!jeffrey@ames.arpa
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1994Jul23.003854.14729@mixcom.mixcom.com>,
<CtDv3v.3I@news.Hawaii.Edu>, <1994Jul23.175023.8086@mixcom.mixcom.com>
Subject : Re: Jeffrey Herman's Email address

In article <1994Jul23.175023.8086@mixcom.mixcom.com> kevin jessup

<kevin.jessup@mixcom.mixcom.com> writes:
>Jeff...
>
>Since all replies to you (over the last 3 months) get
>bounced back with an unknown domain error (as others
>have complained of) perhaps you could provide us with
>an internet Email address that works.

Wow! My name made a subject line!

A couple of months ago I started using my math dept account rather than my UNIX account, to save the math dept some money. For some odd reason which no one can figure out (and these guys are supposed to be experts?) my address reads @kahuna.tmc.edu off my math account. So periodically I will place my REAL address on the sender line or keywords line.

Any of you UNIX experts know how to change the default address?

Jeff NH6IL

jeffrey@math.hawaii.edu or
jherman@uhunix.uhcc.hawaii.edu or
jherman@uhunix2.uhcc.hawaii.edu or
jherman@uhunix3.uhcc.hawaii.edu or
jeffrey_herman%uhplato@uhcc.hawaii.edu or
jherman@hawaii.edu or
P.O. Box 8282, Honolulu, Hawaii or
just put your message in a bottle and toss it in the Pacific Ocean -
it'll eventually get here.

Date: 23 Jul 94 23:40:48 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!headwall.Stanford.EDU!abercrombie.Stanford.EDU!
paulf@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1994Jul22.184058.2524@mixcom.mixcom.com>,
<CtDpL7.LnL@news.Hawaii.Edu>, <1994Jul23.153750.4971@mixcom.mixcom.com>
Subject : Re: What is wrong with ham radio

kevin jessup <kevin.jessup@mixcom.mixcom.com> writes:

>FM repeaters were a "fad" when first introduced, as was SSB. Amateur
>radio has always had to be dragged, kicking and screaming, into the
>future.

In short, only you know what's best for amateur radio. What an incredibly condescending attitude. Especially for someone who doesn't appear to know much about the history of SSB.

--

--Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "We are meant to be masters of destiny,
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | not victims of fate." -- Ronald W. Reagan

Date: Sat, 23 Jul 1994 17:58:35 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!math.ohio-state.edu!uwm.edu!mixcom.com!
kevin.jessup@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <bmicale.155.2E2F284A@facstaff.wisc.edu>,
<1994Jul23.003854.14729@mixcom.mixcom.com>, <CtDv3v.3I@news.Hawaii.Edu>
Subject : Re: reply

In <CtDv3v.3I@news.Hawaii.Edu> jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman) writes:

>This is only a hobby to me - I am happy to build low power HF
>CW transmitters - I am not interested in anything else nor
>will I allow anyone to dictate to me what I should or shouldn't
>build. If you find fault with this and say I'm not 'advancing
>the state of the art' then pay my tuition so that I can earn
>the necessary PhD or the minimal MS, for that amount of
>knowledge is what is needed to conduct today's research.

There is a difference between actually being the one who designs the state of the art and complete and total ignorance of what the state of the art is and can accomplish. All I am asking is that amateur radio look a little beyond the high-school theory required to pass (for example) the ADvanced written tests.

Certainly the general, advanced and extra class tests could be made a little more up to date. And it is obvious to all here that Jeff and I will never agree on anything.

--

kevin.jessup@mixcom.com | Vote Libertarian!
|
| Call 1-800-682-1776
| for more information.

Date: Sat, 23 Jul 94 17:17:53 -0500

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!newsserver.jvnc.net!yale.edu!
noc.near.net!news2.near.net!news.delphi.com!usenet@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1994Jul23.003854.14729@mixcom.mixcom.com>,
<CtDv3v.3I@news.Hawaii.Edu>, <1994Jul23.175835.8344@mixcom.mixcom.com>^
Subject : Re: reply

kevin jessup <kevin.jessup@mixcom.mixcom.com> writes:

>the state of the art is and can accomplish. All I am asking is
>that amateur radio look a little beyond the high-school theory
>required to pass (for example) the ADvanced written tests.

In the 82-year history of the amateur services, licenses have always been within the reach of motivated high school (and some younger) students. In fact, pre-college students have usually been a major source of new hams. Are you suggesting that hf operating be placed beyond the reach of such students?

Date: Sat, 23 Jul 1994 17:50:23 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!math.ohio-state.edu!uwm.edu!mixcom.com!
kevin.jessup@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <bmicales.155.2E2F284A@facstaff.wisc.edu>,
<1994Jul23.003854.14729@mixcom.mixcom.com>, <CtDv3v.3I@news.Hawaii.Edu>
Subject : Jeffrey Herman's Email address

Jeff...

Since all replys to you (over the last 3 months) get bounced back with an unknown domain error (as others have complained of) perhaps you could provide us with an internet Email address that works.

--
kevin.jessup@mixcom.com | Vote Libertarian!
|
| Call 1-800-682-1776
| for more information.

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #326
